## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Billy Lee Lisenby, Jr.,	) C/A No.: 5:14-cv-01830-DCN-KDW
Plaintiff,	) )
v.	) Report and Recommendation
v.	) Report and Recommendation
Warden Cecilia Reynolds, Lt. Robert	, )
Miller, Grievance Clerk P. Hough, James	)
S. Sligh, Jr., Major D. Seward, A. Sellers,	)
DHO, Counsel Substitute Armstrong, and	)
Mr. Padula,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 27, 2015, Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 62. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on March 2, 2015, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of such motions and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 63. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending this case. Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.

On April 22, 2015, the court ordered Plaintiff to advise whether he wished to continue with the case by May 22, 2015. ECF No. 68. Plaintiff has filed no response. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion of Defendants and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends this action be dismissed

with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

June 1, 2015 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Haymai D. Hest

The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached "Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation."